

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 6, 8 and 9 are amended, and claims 10-15 are added. Support for the added claims can be found in the specification at page 6, lines 6-13, page 10, lines 13-20, and page 11, lines 7-17. Reconsideration based on the above Amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,608,468 to Gove et al.¹ (hereinafter "Gove"); claims 1, 2 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,355,251 to Parks (hereinafter "Parks"); and claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks in view of Gove. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the applied art teaches, discloses or suggests an array of pixel electrodes stacked over the array of control elements, wherein each of the reflective pixel electrodes is formed in a first substantially rectangular region having a first aspect ratio, and each of the control elements is formed in a second substantially rectangular region having second aspect ratio different from the first aspect ratio, as recited in claims 10 and 13. Further, the areas of the first and second substantially rectangular regions are equal to each other, as recited in claims 11 and 14. Finally, the pixel electrodes partly overlap the corresponding control elements, as recited in claims 12 and 15.

In a display device according to this invention, an array of control elements are arranged to correspond to an array of pixel electrodes that are arranged in the upper layer, even though miniaturization of the control elements does not permit the shape of the control

¹ We believe the Examiner's reference to U.S. Patent No. 5,608,468 to Grove et al. is an error. We assume that the patent in question is U.S. Patent No. 5,608,468 to Gove et al.

elements in a lower layer to match the shape of the pixel electrodes, as disclosed in the specification, lines 23-26, page 11.

The Examiner asserts on page 2 of the Office Action that Gove, discloses a spatial light modulator with hexagonal pixels that allow the posts and electrodes to be arrayed in horizontal lines. However, Gove does not show that these electrodes are formed in a region having an aspect ratio different from that of the mirror.

Parks does not make up for the deficiencies of Gove discussed above. Specifically, Parks teaches a liquid crystal display (LCD) 10 shown in Figure 1. A pass-gate transistor 28 which corresponds to the control element, is placed adjacent to each display electrode 26, which corresponds to the pixel electrode (please see column 2, lines 44-47). Also, in the LCD 50 shown in Figures 5 and 6 in Parks, control circuit 67, including a pass-gate transistor 28 and a memory element 34, is arranged inside the octagonal path in the cross-over region 58 bounded by corners of four adjacent electrodes 52 (column 6, line 60, - column 7, line 2, column 8, lines 24-25).

As such, Parks does not disclose an array of pixel electrodes stacked over an array of control elements. Rather, in the LCD of Parks, the control elements (pass-gate transistors and memory elements) are placed in horizontally different places where the pixel electrodes (display electrodes) are not placed.

Further, none of the applied art teaches, discloses or even suggests, an array of control elements or an array of reflective pixel electrodes arranged in rows and columns with a first pitch and a second pitch, wherein the control elements are arranged in same directions as the rows and columns of the pixel electrodes with (i) a third pitch different from the first pitch, (ii) a fourth pitch different from the second pitch, and (iii) a product of the first and second pitches equal to a product of the third and fourth pitches, as claimed in claim 6 and similarly claimed in claim 9. The Office Action does not discuss these features.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15 define patentable subject matter and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

II. Conclusion

Should the Examiner believe that anything is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

JAO:KMM:RBI/gam

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 19, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--